

Indiana Pro Bono Commission
230 East Ohio Street, 4th Floor
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Indiana Bar Foundation
230 East Ohio Street, Suite 110
Indianapolis, IN 46204

**COMBINED 2002 DISTRICT REPORT, 2004 PRO BONO GRANT
APPLICATION, AND 2004 PLAN**

Pro Bono District 6

Applicant: District 6 Access to Justice, Inc.

Mailing Address: 1215 Race Street, Suite 340

City: New Castle **IN** **Zip:** 47362

Phone: (765) 529-1403 **Fax:** (765) 599-2498

E-mail address: mwillis@henryco.net **Web site address:** probono@inbar.org

Judicial Appointee: Mary G. Willis, Henry Circuit Court

Plan Administrator: Connie Power through May, 2003 - seeking replacement

Names of Counties served: Henry; Madison; Delaware; Blackford; Randolph;
Grant; and Jay

Amount of grant received for 2002: \$31,776.75

***Amount of grant unused from 2002 and previous years:** \$58,410.15

*** Amount of grant unused but committed to expenses in 2003:** \$15,000

Amount of grant received for 2003: \$7,120

Amount requested for 2004: \$20,000

*** Please submit request for approval to the Indiana Bar Foundation.**

The following representations, made to the best of our knowledge and belief, are being provided to the Indiana Pro Bono Commission and Indiana Bar Foundation in anticipation of their review and evaluation of our funding request and our commitment and value to our Pro Bono District.

Operation under Rule 6.5

In submitting this application for funding, this district is representing itself as having a Pro Bono Plan, which is pursuant to Rule 6.5 of the Indiana Rules of Professional Conduct. The plan enables attorneys in our district to discharge their professional responsibilities to provide civil legal pro bono services; improves the overall delivery of civil legal services to persons of limited means by facilitating the integration and coordination of services provided by pro bono organizations and other legal assistance organizations in our district; and ensures access to high quality and timely pro bono civil legal services for persons of limited means by (1) fostering the development of new civil legal pro bono programs where needed and (2) supporting and improving the quality of existing civil legal pro bono programs. The plan also fosters the growth of a public service culture within the our district which values civil legal pro bono publico service and promotes the ongoing development of financial and other resources for civil legal pro bono organizations.

We have adhered to Rule 6.5 (f) by having a district pro bono committee composed of:

- A. the judge designated by the Supreme Court to preside;
- B. to the extent feasible, one or more representatives from each voluntary bar association in the district, one representative from each pro bono and legal assistance provider in the district, and one representative from each law school in the district; and
- C. at least two (2) community-at-large representatives, one of whom shall be a present or past recipient of pro bono publico legal services.

We have determined the governance of our district pro bono committee as well as the terms of service of our members. Replacement and succession members are appointed by the judge designated by the Supreme Court.

Pursuant to Rule 6.5 (g) to ensure an active and effective district pro bono program, we:

- A. prepare in written form, on an annual basis, a district pro bono plan, including any county sub-plans if appropriate, after evaluating the needs of the district and making a determination of presently available pro bono services;
- B. select and employ a plan administrator to provide the necessary coordination and administrative support for the district pro bono committee;
- C. implement the district pro bono plan and monitor its results;
- D. submit an annual report to the Commission; and
- E. forward to the Pro Bono Commission for review and consideration any requests which were presented as formal proposals to be included in the district plan but

were rejected by the district committee, provided the group asks for review by the Pro Bono Commission.

Commitment to Pro Bono Program Excellence

We also understand that ultimately the measure of success for a civil legal services program, whether a staffed or volunteer attorney program, is the outcomes achieved for clients, and the relationship of these outcomes to clients' most critical legal needs. We agree to strive for the following hallmarks which are characteristics enhancing a pro bono program's ability to succeed in providing effective services addressing clients' critical needs.

1. **Participation by the local bar associations.** The associations believe the program is necessary and beneficial.
2. **Centrality of client needs.** The mission of the program is to provide high quality free civil legal services to low-income persons through volunteer attorneys. Client needs drive the program, balanced by the nature and quantity of resources available. The staff and volunteers are respectful of clients and sensitive to their needs.
3. **Program priorities.** The program engages in a priority-setting process, which determines what types of problems the program will address. Resources are allocated to matters of greatest impact on the client and are susceptible to civil legal resolution. The program calls on civil legal services and other programs serving low-income people to assist in this process.
4. **Direct representation component.** The core of the program is direct representation in which volunteer attorneys engage in advocacy on behalf of low-income persons. Adjunct programs such as advice clinics, pro se clinics and paralegal assistance are dictated by client needs and support the core program.
5. **Coordination with state and local civil legal service programs and bar associations.** The programs work cooperatively with the local funded civil legal services programs. The partnerships between the civil legal services programs and the local bar association results in a variety of benefits including sharing of expertise, coordination of services, and creative solutions to problems faced by the client community.
6. **Accountability.** The program has mechanisms for evaluating the quality of service it provides. It expects and obtains reporting from participating attorneys concerning the progress/outcome of referred cases. It has the capability to demonstrate compliance with requirements imposed by its funding source(s), and it has a grievance procedure for the internal resolution of disputes between attorneys and clients.
7. **Continuity.** The program has a form of governance, which ensures the program will survive changes in bar leadership, and has operational guidelines, which enable the program to survive a change in staff.
8. **Cost-effectiveness.** The program maximizes the level of high quality civil legal services it provides in relationship to the total amount of funding received.
9. **Minimization of barriers.** The program addresses in a deliberate manner linguistic, sensory, physical and cultural barriers to clients' ability to receive services from the program. The program does not create undue administrative barriers to client access.

10. Understanding of ethical considerations. The program operates in a way which is consistent with the Rules of Professional Conduct; client confidentiality is assured and conflicts of interest are avoided.

11. ABA Standards. The program is designed to be as consistent with the ABA Standards for Programs Providing Civil Pro Bono Legal Services to Persons of Limited Means as possible.

No events, shortages or irregularities have occurred and no facts have been discovered which would make the financial statements provided to you materially inaccurate or misleading. To our knowledge there is nothing reflecting unfavorably upon the honesty or integrity of members of our organization. We have accounted for all known or anticipated operating revenue and expense in preparing our funding request.

We agree to provide human-interest stories promoting Pro Bono activities in a timely manner upon request of the Indiana Bar Foundation or Indiana Pro Bono Commission. We further agree to make ourselves available to meet with the Pro Bono Commission and/or the Indiana Bar Foundation to answer any questions or provide any material requested which serves as verification/source documentation for the submitted information.

Explanation of items stricken from the above Letter of Representation:

It is understood that this Letter does not replace the Grant Agreement or other documents required by the Indiana Bar Foundation or Indiana Pro Bono Commission.

Signatures:



Judicial Appointee Signature



Date

Plan Administrator Signature

Date

2002 REPORT AND 2004 PLAN SUMMARIES

1. In 125 words or less, please write a brief summary of your District's 2002 progress suitable for use in press releases.

District 6 Access to Justice, Inc. successfully hired a part-time Plan Administrator who began the process of soliciting more County representatives and establishing administrative forms for tracking and accountability. Delaware and Henry Counties have offered programs for Continuing Legal Education in the area of pro bono awareness and other counties are looking to establish similar programs in the Fall. Efforts to assist each county in the programs to establish *pro se* services to complement Pro Bono services are being developed.

2. In 125 words or less, please write a brief summary of the 2004 grant request suitable for use in press releases related to any grant award. Suggested areas to cover are: needs to be addressed, methods, target audience, and anticipated outcomes.

The greatest need to be addressed is the coordination of services between attorneys, the courts, service agencies and legal service providers. The method to reach the target audience of low income persons is through the coordination of services through a plan administrator. The anticipated outcome is education and the tracking of services to determine success and the dissemination of results among each of the participating counties.

2002 REPORT

In the next two pages, describe your District's 2002 achievements and activities in relation to the plan approved for 2002 funding. It is permissible to include a relevant number of appendices to further describe 2002 achievements. Please number and reference the appendices.

District 6 was able to form a corporation entitled "District 6 Access to Justice, Inc." in 2002. All corporate and Internal Revenue Service applications were completed and filed. In addition, all corporation requirements for notice, officer election and minute recording were observed.

A great deal of time and money for advertising was expended in 2002 in order to locate and secure a qualified Plan Administrator. Space considerations, virtual office decisions, insurance determinations and equipment matters were addressed. Several interviews of potential candidates were conducted and the decision to offer a part-time position to a qualified candidate was made.

In December 2002, District 6 Access to Justice, Inc. was successful in locating a qualified Plan Administrator, Connie Power, after a great deal of interviewing and searching. In 2003, The Plan Administrator began the process of coordinating efforts, identifying needs, establishing a "District 6 Access to Justice Plan to Implement" (attached) and making contacts with non-participating counties.

2002 VOLUNTEER LAWYER ACTIVITY				
Legal Service Provider Agency or Organization (Include Bar Associations)	Number of Participating Volunteer Lawyers	Number of Volunteer Lawyer Hours Reported on Cases Closed in 2002	Number of Open Volunteer Lawyer Cases	Number of Low-income Citizens Receiving Limited Legal Information from Volunteer Lawyers*
Delaware Co. Bar Assn.	30	29.15	28	36
Henry Co. Bar Assn.	19	N/A	N/A	N/A
LSI, Inc.	(Not Reported)			

**

*This category includes Volunteer Lawyer public outreach to low income citizens for a one-time, limited contact such as call-in or walk-in information services, pro-se clinics and panel presentations. Please put in parentheses the number of citizens whose income was not determined.

Definitions:

Case: A legal matter referred to a pro bono attorney volunteer

Participating Volunteer Lawyer: An attorney who has rendered pro bono service to at least one low income client during the year or accepted a pro bono referral from the identified program.

** Program Commenced in 2003

2002 VOLUNTEER LAWYER ACTIVITY, CONTINUED*

Please list any volunteer activity category utilized by the organization receiving Pro Bono funding which was not included in the previous table. Include the definition and 2002 statistics for the category.

It is the primary responsibility of the Plan Administrator to gather the statistics for volunteer lawyer activity in each county. Legal Services of Indiana, Inc. maintains statistics for services provided to the low income in District 6. Delaware County also maintains statistics for volunteer lawyer activity. These statistics are attached. Henry County has established a Pro Bono Intake Coordinator and statistics will be available commencing with the 2003 calendar year.

In order to make reporting more consistent and concise in the future, please list the various categories used by legal service providers in your district for recording volunteer lawyer activity. Define each category. (If more than one agency or organization has the same category and definition, please list it once, indicating the number of organizations using the category.)

Bankruptcy
Contract Disputes
Debtor/creditor
Divorce
Guardianship - adult and juvenile
Health Care Directives
Insurance Benefits
Juvenile emancipation
Landlord/Tenant
Medication - civil and domestic
Real Estate
Tax matters (individuals)
Wills and Estates

2002 VOLUNTEER LAWYER ACTIVITY BY TYPE OF CASE

Number Of Lawyers Participating In Pro Se Clinics, Call-In Services And Other Limited Informational Activities in 2002: _____.

Type Of Case (Primary Issue)	Total Of All District Legal Service Provider Active Cases Assigned To And Accepted By A Volunteer Lawyer.
Consumer/Finance	
Education	
Employment	
Family	
Guardianship	
Juvenile	
Health	
Housing	
Immigration/Naturalization	
Income Maintenance	
Individual Rights	
Mediation	
Wills & Estates	
Other (specify)	
Total Number of Cases	

2004 PLAN AND REQUEST

On the following two pages, describe items or activities planned for 2004 for which funding is requested.

If a special event, such as a pro se clinic, volunteer banquet, or Continuing Legal Education seminar is planned, please include the projected cost of the event in parenthesis at the end of the descriptive paragraph.

At the end of 2004, District 6 proposes to host a recognition luncheon in each of the participating counties recognizing every attorney who provided pro bono services and honor the attorney who has contributed the most significantly in each county to Pro Bono efforts.

Estimated cost \$500 per 7 counties: \$3,500.00
(Item #12 on budget)

District 6 proposes to support the each counties' *pro se* and efforts which are complementary in nature to Pro Bono efforts and can maximize the effectiveness of volunteer attorney time in providing pro bono efforts. Using the models developed in Delaware and Henry County, each county would hire a Pro Bono Intake Coordinator who would interview applicants and make referrals to participating volunteer attorneys or provide pro se informational packets and forms.

Estimated cost \$2,000 per 7 counties: \$14,000.00
(Item #17 on budget)

District 6 proposes to commence a litigation fund available for volunteer attorneys to utilize for expenses such as bonds and appraisals.

Estimated cost for 7 counties: \$ 2,000.00
(Item #13 on budget)

The foregoing constitutes new costs and expenses for District 6 Access to Justice, Inc. and serve to support the request for funding for the calendar year 2004 in the amount of \$20,000.00

2004 PLAN AND REQUEST, CONTINUED

2004 PRO BONO DISTRICT ACTIVITIES

Please check the activities, which your district organization will provide during 2004 to support the bono efforts of the attorneys in your district. If the activity is provided by another organization in your district, please put a plus sign (+) in the blank following the activity.

- ☐ Providing intake and screening of prospective clients ☐ +
- ☐ Providing referral of prospective clients ☐ +
- ☐ Matching cases with individual attorney experience ☐ +
- ☒ Establishing and/or maintaining specialized panels of volunteer lawyers based on area of practice emphasis ☐
- ☒ Providing resources for litigation and out-of-pocket expenses ☐
- ☒ Providing legal education and training for pro bono attorneys in areas of practice emphasis useful in providing pro bono civil legal service ☐
- ☐ Providing the availability of consultation with attorneys whose practice concentration is in an area of law about which a volunteer lawyer is providing pro bono civil legal service (mentoring) ☐ +
- ☒ Providing malpractice insurance for volunteer pro bono lawyers ☐
- ☒ Establishing and/or maintaining procedures to ensure adequate monitoring and follow-up ☐
- ☒ Establishing and/or maintaining procedures to measure client satisfaction ☐
- ☒ Recognizing pro bono civil legal service by lawyers ☐
- ☒ Providing community outreach, legal education services or programs ☐
- ☐ Other _____
- ☐ Other _____

2004 PRO BONO DISTRICT ACTIVITIES, continued

1. List the joint efforts, activities or programs in which your district organization will be involved. Please include the name of the other organization(s), a brief description of the activity and a description of the resources provided to the effort by all participating organizations.

District 6 has established joint programs with the Delaware, Henry and Madison County Bar Associations to provide education in the form of continuing legal education seminars. In addition, District 6 works jointly with Legal Services of Indiana, Inc. which is located in Anderson to provide office space and referrals.

2. Number of cases in your district awaiting assignment to a Volunteer Pro Bono Attorney as of the date this report is prepared: 0

3. Percentage estimate of the types of cases awaiting assignment: 0%

4. List the efforts that will be made to recruit new pro bono volunteer lawyers:

Using the Delaware County system as a model, the Plan Administrator will coordinate efforts in each county to establish an Intake Coordinator to screen applicants, maintain records, and make referrals. These efforts include obtaining participant information from the Bar Association members in each county and making referrals based upon individual areas of practice.

ANNUAL TIMETABLE FOR SUBMISSION OF FORMS AND CHECKS

January 1:	Checks distributed
July 1:	Annual report, plan and grant application due to IPBC
November:	Notification of awards
December 1:	IBF grant agreement due and revised budget due (as needed)


2004 DISTRICT BUDGET FORM

COST CATEGORY	IOLTA \$	OTHER \$	DONATED	TOTAL	2003 Revised & Estimated
A. Personnel Costs					
1. Plan Administrator	22,000				
2. Lawyers					
3. Paralegals					
4. Others					
5. Salary Subtotal					
6. Employee Benefits	3,000				
7. Total Personnel Costs					25,000
B. Non Personnel					
1. Occupancy					
2. Equipment Rental					
3. Office Supplies FAX/Copier	150				
4. Telephone \$30/mo	360				
5. Travel Auto Ins.	1,100				
6. Training Access to Justice	1,500				
7. Library Conference					
8. Malpractice Insurance	2,000				
9. Dues and Fees IRS	250				
10. Audit					
11. Contingent Reserve Fund for Operating Expenses	2,000				
12. Marketing and Promotion	3,500				
13. Litigation (Includes Expert Fees)	2,000				
14. Property Acquisition					
15. Purchase Payments					
16. Contract Services to Clients					
17. Contract Services to Program County Support	14,000				
18. Other CPA	150				
19. Total Non Personnel Costs					27,010
C. Total Expenditures					
1. Total Program Disbursements					
2. Litigation Fund *					

*Reserves in this category are not required to be resubmitted to the IBF if not spent during the allocation calendar year.,

**DISTRICT 6 ACCESS TO JUSTICE
PLAN TO IMPLEMENT
PRO BONO WORK
2003**

1. Set up working plan in four major counties to be ran by the local bar association.
 - A. Madison County, Delaware County, Grant County, Henry County
 - B. Ran by committee within local bar association
 - C. Overseen by district committee
 - D. Assisted by plan administrator
2. Set up CLE seminar with each bar association.
 - A. 1 or 2 per year.
 - B. In conjunction with Pro Bono Commission.
 - C. During regular bar association meeting.
 - D. Recruitment emphasis.
 - E. Educate on IOLTA and encourage involvement
3. Recruit attorneys
 - A. To do intake work
 - B. To handle cases – 25% of attorneys in each county
 - C. Through seminars, mailings – create brochure, phone contact, bar association meetings, judge encouragement, face to face scheduled meetings.
 - D. Heartwarming articles in local paper to promote the cause and give recognition to the attorney and firm represented in doing the work.
4. Recruit Support Staff
 - A. Money for litigation expenses.
 - B. Forms to simplify attorney work.
 - C. Pare legal to assist research.
 - D. Volunteers for deposition work as needed.
5. Recognition Ceremony in January/February 2004 for each of the counties involvement in 2003.
 - A. Recognition by local judges.
 - B. Recognition by Supreme Court officials.
 - C. Formal recognition
 - D. Local newspaper coverage.
6. Client Base
 - A. Meet with local shelter directors.
 - B. Judge referrals
 - C. LSOI referrals
 - D. CASA referrals
 - E. Newspaper ads letting people know where to go for help.




<p>The Honorable Mary G. Willis Judge, Henry Circuit Court 1215 Race Street, Suite 340 New Castle, IN 47362 765-529-1403 mwillis@henryco.net Supreme Court Designee</p>	<p>The Honorable Jack L. Brinkman Judge, Madison Superior Court II 16 E. 9th Street, Box 25, Ste. 405 Anderson, IN 46016 765-641-9627 jbrinkman@madisoncty.com District 6 President</p>
<p>Blackford County 15 attorneys</p>	<p>D. Eric Hall (Rick) One Citizens Plaza 800 Main Street, PO Box 151568 Anderson, IN 46015 765-644-2891 hallde@iquest.net Madison County 158 attorneys</p>
<p>Richard Hughes (Dick) 201 E. Jackson St, Ste. 400 Muncie, IN 47305 765-288-3651 rhughes@defur.com Delaware County 136 attorneys</p>	<p>Randolph County 23 attorneys</p>
<p>Dana Kenworthy Grant Co. Deputy Prosecutor 101 E. 4th St, Room 107 Marion, IN 46952 765-664-0739 dkenworthy@grantcounty.net Grant County 77 attorneys</p>	<p>Sean T. Newberry Indiana Legal Services, Inc. 1106 Meridian Plaza, Suite 215 Anderson, IN 46016 765-642-2473 sean.newberry@ilsi.net Legal Assistance Provider</p>
<p>Robert Wischart Wischart Law Offices 580 Locust Street, PO Box 189 Middletown, IN 47356 765-354-2226 wischart@aol.com Henry County 38 attorneys</p>	<p>Gordon Stafford 655 N. Elm Street Muncie, IN Community At-Large Representative</p>
<p>Jay County 15 attorneys</p>	<p>Pro Bono Coordinator, District 6</p>

DISTRICT 6

PRO BONO

STATISTICS



JUNE 2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
LAWYERS.....	1
POPULATION	2
POVERTY POPULATION	3
AREA.....	4
(SQUARE MILES)	
DENSITY	5
(POPULATION PER SQUARE MILE)	
DISTRICT 6 SUMMARIES	6-7
BLACKFORD COUNTY	8-9
DELAWARE COUNTY	10-11
GRANT COUNTY	12-13
HENRY COUNTY	14-15
JAY COUNTY.....	16-17
MADISON COUNTY	18-19
RANDOLPH COUNTY.....	20-21
COMBINED	22-22-A
SELECTED COUNTIES	23-24

Ct. #2

rt #2



LAWYERS

STATE TOTALS	12,500
DISTRICT 6 TOTAL	449
DISTRICT 6 % OF STATE	3.6

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>% OF STATE</u>	<u>% OF DISTRICT 6</u>
MADISON	148	1.2	33.0
DELAWARE	137	1.1	30.5
GRANT	74	.6	16.5
HENRY	37	.3	8.2
RANDOLPH	23	.2	5.1
JAY	16	.1	3.6
BLACKFORD	<u>14</u>	<u>.1</u>	<u>3.1</u>
TOTALS	449	3.6	100

THESE FIGURES WERE OBTAINED FROM THE CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT ON MAY 13, 2003.

POPULATION

STATE

6,114,745

DISTRICT 6 POPULATION

434,881

DISTRICT 6 % OF STATE

7.1

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>POPULATION</u>	<u>% of STATE</u>	<u>% of DISTRICT 6</u>
MADISON	132,352	2.2	30.4
DELAWARE	118,531	1.9	27.3
GRANT	72,605	1.2	16.7
HENRY	48,408	.8	11.1
RANDOLPH	27,364	.5	6.3
JAY	21,769	.3	5.0
BLACKFORD	<u>13,852</u>	<u>.2</u>	<u>3.2</u>
TOTALS	434,881	7.1	100

THESE FIGURES WERE OBTAINED FROM THE U.S. CENSUS BUREAU QUICK FACTS.

POVERTY POPULATION

STATE AVERAGE %
9.5

NUMBER
580,900

DISTRICT 6 AVERAGE %
8.4

NUMBER
48,771

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>% RATE OF COUNTY</u>	<u>POVERTY POPULATION</u>	<u>% OF STATE</u>	<u>% OF DISTRICT 6</u>
DELAWARE	15.1	17,898	3.1	36.7
GRANT	11.8	8,567	1.5	17.6
RANDOLPH	11.1	3,037	.5	6.2
MADISON	9.3	12,308	2.1	25.2
JAY	9.1	1,980	.3	4.1
BLACKFORD	8.7	1,205	.2	2.5
HENRY	<u>7.8</u>	<u>3,776</u>	<u>.7</u>	<u>7.7</u>
TOTALS	10.4 COUNTY AVERAGE DISTRICT 6	48,771	8.4	100

THESE FIGURES WERE OBTAINED FROM THE U.S. CENSUS BUREAU QUICK FACTS.

LAND AREA

(SQUARE MILES)

STATE

35,867

DISTRICT 6

2,654

DISTRICT 6 % OF STATE

7.4%

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>SQUARE MILES</u>	<u>% OF STATE</u>	<u>% OF DISTRICT 6</u>
RANDOLPH	453	1.3	17.0
MADISON	452	1.3	17.0
GRANT	414	1.2	15.6
DELAWARE	393	1.1	14.8
HENRY	393	1.1	14.8
JAY	384	1.0	14.5
BLACKFORD	<u>165</u>	<u>.4</u>	<u>6.3</u>
TOTALS	2,654	7.4	100

THESE FIGURES WERE OBTAINED FROM THE U.S. CENSUS BUREAU QUICK FACTS.

POPULATION DENSITY

(PER SQUARE MILE)

STATE AVERAGE

169.5

DISTRICT 6 AVERAGE

157.2

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>POPULATION PER SQUARE MILE</u>	<u>% OF STATE</u>	<u>% OF DISTRICT 6</u>
DEAWARE	302	178	27.5
MADISON	295	174	26.8
GRANT	177.3	105	16.1
HENRY	123.5	73	11.2
BLACKFORD	85.1	50	7.7
RANDOLPH	60.5	36	5.5
JAY	<u>56.8</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>5.2</u>
TOTALS	157.2	92.8	100
	DISTRICT 6 AVERAGE	DISTRICT 6 AVERAGE OF STATE	

THESE FIGURES WERE OBTAINED FROM U.S. CENSUS BUREAU QUICK FACTS.

DISTRICT 6

SUMMARIES

<u>LAWYERS</u>	449
STATE	12,500
% OF STATE	3.6

<u>POPULATION</u>	434,881
STATE	6,114,745
% OF STATE	7.1

<u>POVERTY</u>	
<u>POPULATION</u>	48,771
STATE	580,900
% OF STATE	8.4

<u>AREA</u>	2,654
(SQUARE MILES)	
STATE	35,867
% OF STATE	7.4

<u>POPULATION</u>	
<u>DENSITY</u>	157.2
(POPULATION PER SQUARE MILE)	
STATE	169.5
% OF STATE AVERAGE	92.8

POPULATION PER LAWYER

STATE	489.2
DISTRICT 6	968.6

POVERTY POPULATION PER LAWYER

STATE	46.5
DISTRICT 6	108.6

AREA PER LAWYER

(SQUARE MILES)

STATE	2.9
DISTRICT 6	5.9

BLACKFORD COUNTY

LAWYERS

STATE	14
DISTRICT 6	12,500
% OF STATE	449
% OF DISTRICT 6	.1
	3.1

POPULATION

STATE	13,852
DISTRICT 6	6,114,745
% OF STATE	434,881
% OF DISTRICT 6	.2
	3.2

POVERTY POPULATION

STATE	1,205
DISTRICT 6	580,900
% RATE OF COUNTY	48,771
% RATE OF STATE	8.7
% RATE OF DISTRICT 6	9.5
% OF STATE	8.4
% OF DISTRICT 6	.2
	2.5

AREA (SQUARE MILES)

STATE	165
DISTRICT 6	35,867
% OF STATE	2,654
% OF DISTRICT 6	.4
	6.3

POPULATION DENSITY (POPULATION PER SQUARE MILE)

STATE	85.1
DISTRICT 6	169.5
% OF STATE AVERAGE	157.2
% OF DISTRICT 6	50.0
	7.7

BLACKFORD COUNTY

POPULATION PER LAWYER

STATE	489.2
DISTRICT 6	968.6
BLACKFORD COUNTY	989.4

POVERTY POPULATION PER LAWYER

STATE	46.5
DISTRICT 6	108.6
BLACKFORD COUNTY	86.1

AREA (SQUARE MILES) PER LAWYER

STATE	2.9
DISTRICT 6	5.9
BLACKFORD COUNTY	11.8

DELAWARE COUNTY

LAWYERS

	137
STATE	12,500
DISTRICT 6	449
% OF STATE	1.1
% OF DISTRICT 6	30.5

POPULATION

	118,531
STATE	6,114,745
DISTRICT 6	434,881
% OF STATE	1.9
% OF DISTRICT 6	27.3

POVERTY POPULATION

	17,898
STATE	580,900
DISTRICT 6	48,771
% RATE OF COUNTY	15.1
% RATE OF STATE	9.5
% RATE OF DISTRICT 6	8.4
% OF STATE	3.1
% OF DISTRICT 6	36.7

AREA

(SQUARE MILES)	393
STATE	35,867
DISTRICT 6	2,654
% OF STATE	1.1
% OF DISTRICT 6	14.8

POPULATION DENSITY

(POPULATION PER SQUARE MILE)

	302
STATE	169.5
DISTRICT 6	157.2
% OF STATE AVERAGE	178
% OF DISTRICT 6	27.5

DELAWARE COUNTY

POPULATION PER LAWYER

STATE	489.2
DISTRICT 6	968.6
DELAWARE COUNTY	865.2

POVERTY POPULATION PER LAWYER

STATE	46.5
DISTRICT 6	108.6
DELAWARE COUNTY	130.6

AREA (SQUARE MILES) PER LAWYER

STATE	2.9
DISTRICT 6	5.9
DELAWARE COUNTY	2.9

GRANT COUNTY

LAWYERS

	74
STATE	12,500
DISTRICT 6	449
% OF STATE	.6
% OF DISTRICT 6	16.5

POPULATION

	72,605
STATE	6,114,745
DISTRICT 6	434,881
% OF STATE	1.2
% OF DISTRICT 6	16.7

POVERTY POPULATION

	8,567
STATE	580,900
DISTRICT 6	48,771
% RATE OF COUNTY	11.8
% RATE OF STATE	9.5
% RATE OF DISTRICT 6	8.4
% OF STATE	1.5
% OF DISTRICT 6	17.6

AREA

(SQUARE MILES)	414
STATE	35,867
DISTRICT 6	2,654
% OF STATE	1.3
% OF DISTRICT 6	15.6

POPULATION DENSITY (POPULATION PER SQUARE MILE)

	177.3
STATE	169.5
DISTRICT 6	157.2
% OF STATE AVERAGE	105
% OF DISTRICT 6	16.1

GRANT COUNTY

POPULATION PER LAWYER

STATE	489.2
DISTRICT 6	968.6
GRANTCOUNTY	981.1

POVERTY POPULATION PER LAWYER

STATE	46.5
DISTRICT 6	108.6
GRANT COUNTY	115.8

AREA (SQUARE MILES) PER LAWYER

STATE	2.9
DISTRICT 6	5.9
GRANT COUNTY	5.6

HENRY COUNTY

LAWYERS

	37
STATE	12,500
DISTRICT 6	449
% OF STATE	.3
% OF DISTRICT 6	8.2

POPULATION

	48,408
STATE	6,114,745
DISTRICT 6	434,881
% OF STATE	.8
% OF DISTRICT 6	11.1

POVERTY POPULATION

	3,776
STATE	580,900
DISTRICT 6	48,771
% RATE OF COUNTY	7.8
% RATE OF STATE	9.5
% RATE OF DISTRICT 6	8.4
% OF STATE	.7
% OF DISTRICT 6	7.7

AREA

(SQUARE MILES)	393
STATE	35,867
DISTRICT 6	2,654
% OF STATE	1.1
% OF DISTRICT 6	14.8

POPULATION DENSITY

(POPULATION PER SQUARE MILE)

	123.5
STATE	169.5
DISTRICT 6	157.2
% OF STATE AVERAGE	73.0
% OF DISTRICT 6	11.2

HENRY COUNTY

POPULATION PER LAWYER

STATE	489.2
DISTRICT 6	968.6
HENRY COUNTY	1,308.3

POVERTY POPULATION PER LAWYER

STATE	46.5
DISTRICT 6	108.6
HENRY COUNTY	102.1

AREA (SQUARE MILES) PER LAWYER

STATE	2.9
DISTRICT 6	5.9
HENRY COUNTY	10.6

JAY COUNTY

LAWYERS

	16
STATE	12,500
DISTRICT 6	449
% OF STATE	.1
% OF DISTRICT 6	3.6

POPULATION

	21,769
STATE	6,114,745
DISTRICT 6	434,881
% OF STATE	.3
% OF DISTRICT 6	5.0

POVERTY POPULATION

	1,980
STATE	580,900
DISTRICT 6	48,771
% RATE OF COUNTY	9.1
% RATE OF STATE	9.5
% RATE OF DISTRICT 6	8.4
% OF STATE	.3
% OF DISTRICT 6	4.1

AREA

(SQUARE MILES)	384
STATE	35,867
DISTRICT 6	2,654
% OF STATE	1.0
% OF DISTRICT 6	14.5

POPULATION DENSITY (POPULATION PER SQUARE MILE)

	56.8
STATE	169.5
DISTRICT 6	157.2
% OF STATE AVERAGE	34.0
% OF DISTRICT 6	5.2

JAY COUNTY

POPULATION PER LAWYER

STATE	489.2
DISTRICT 6	968.6
JAY COUNTY	1,360.6

POVERTY POPULATION PER LAWYER

STATE	46.5
DISTRICT 6	108.6
JAY COUNTY	123.8

AREA (SQUARE MILES) PER LAWYER

STATE	2.9
DISTRICT 6	5.9
JAY COUNTY	24

MADISON COUNTY

LAWYERS

STATE	148
DISTRICT 6	12,500
% OF STATE	449
% OF DISTRICT 6	1.2
	33.0

POPULATION

STATE	132,352
DISTRICT 6	6,114,745
% OF STATE	434,881
% OF DISTRICT 6	2.2
	30.4

POVERTY POPULATION

STATE	12,308
DISTRICT 6	580,900
% RATE OF COUNTY	48,771
% RATE OF STATE	9.3
% RATE OF DISTRICT 6	9.5
% OF STATE	8.4
% OF DISTRICT 6	2.1
	25.2

AREA

(SQUARE MILES)	452
STATE	35,867
DISTRICT 6	2,654
% OF STATE	1.3
% OF DISTRICT 6	17.0

POPULATION DENSITY (POPULATION PER SQUARE MILE)

STATE	295
DISTRICT 6	169.5
% OF STATE AVERAGE	157.2
% OF DISTRICT 6	174
	26.8

MADISON COUNTY

POPULATION PER LAWYER

STATE	489.2
DISTRICT 6	968.6
MADISON COUNTY	894.3

POVERTY POPULATION PER LAWYER

STATE	46.5
DISTRICT 6	108.6
MADISON COUNTY	83.2

AREA (SQUARE MILES) PER LAWYER

STATE	2.9
DISTRICT 6	5.9
MADISON COUNTY	3.1

RANDOLPH COUNTY

LAWYERS

	23
STATE	12,500
DISTRICT 6	449
% OF STATE	.2
% OF DISTRICT 6	5.1

POPULATION

	27,364
STATE	6,114,745
DISTRICT 6	434,881
% OF STATE	.5
% OF DISTRICT 6	6.3

POVERTY POPULATION

	3,037
STATE	580,900
DISTRICT 6	48,771
% RATE OF COUNTY	11.1
% RATE OF STATE	9.5
% RATE OF DISTRICT 6	8.4
% OF STATE	.5
% OF DISTRICT 6	6.2

AREA (SQUARE MILES)

	453
STATE	35,867
DISTRICT 6	2,654
% OF STATE	1.3
% OF DISTRICT 6	17.0

POPULATION DENSITY (POPULATION PER SQUARE MILE)

	60.5
STATE	169.5
DISTRICT 6	157.2
% OF STATE AVERAGE	36.0
% OF DISTRICT 6	5.5

RANDOLPH COUNTY

POPULATION PER LAWYER

STATE	489.2
DISTRICT 6	968.6
RANDOLPH COUNTY	1,189.7

POVERTY POPULATION PER LAWYER

STATE	46.5
DISTRICT 6	108.6
RANDOLPH COUNTY	132

AREA (SQUARE MILES) PER LAWYER


STATE	2.9
DISTRICT 6	5.9
RANDOLPH COUNTY	19.7

COMBINED

THE RESULT OF THE 5 CATAGORIES PREVIOUSLY ADDRESSED IN
PROPORTION TO COUNTY PERCENTAGES WERE COMBINED AND THE
FOLLOWING PERCENTAGES WERE OBTAINED.

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>%</u>
DELAWARE	27.36
MADISON	26.48
GRANT	16.5
HENRY	10.6
RANDOLPH	8.02
JAY	6.48
BLACKFORD	4.56

COMBINED GRAPHIC



SELECTED COUNTIES

LAWYERS

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>% OF STATE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>
ALLEN	6.2	771
LAKE	7.9	989
MARION	42	5,255
ST. JOSEPH	4.4	550
VANDEBURGH	3.4	425

POPULATION

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>% OF STATE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>
ALLEN	5.4	333,628
LAKE	7.9	485,448
MARION	14.0	856,938
ST. JOSEPH	4.3	264,779
VANDEBURGH	2.8	171,268

POVERTY POPULATION

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>% OF COUNTY</u>	<u>% OF STATE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>
ALLEN	9.1	5.2	30,360
LAKE	12.2	10.2	59,225
MARION	11.4	16.8	97,691
ST. JOSEPH	11.2	5.1	29,655
VANDEBURGH	10.4	3.1	17,812

LAND AREA (SQUARE MILES)

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>% OF STATE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>
ALLEN	1.8	657
LAKE	1.4	497
MARION	1.1	396
ST. JOSEPH	1.3	457
VANDEBURG	.7	235

SELECTED COUNTIES

POPULATION DENSITY (PER SQUARE MILE)

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>
ALLEN	504.9
LAKE	975
MARION	2,171.5
ST. JOSEPH	580.7
VANDERBURGH	732.9

POPULATION PER LAWYER

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>
ALLEN	432.7
LAKE	490.8
MARION	163.1
ST. JOSEPH	481.4
VANDERBURGH	403

POVERTY POPULATION PER LAWYER

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>
ALLEN	39.4
LAKE	59.9
MARION	18.6
ST. JOSEPH	53.9
VANDERBURGH	41.9

LAND AREA (SQUARE MILES PER LAWYER)

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>
ALLEN	.9
LAKE	.5
MARION	.1
ST. JOSEPH	.8
VANDERBURGH	.6

STATE AND DISTRICT 6 COUNTY AVERAGES

LAWYERS

STATE COUNTY AVERAGE	135.9
DISTRICT 6 COUNTY AVERAGE	64.1

POPULATION

STATE COUNTY AVERAGE	66,464.6
DISTRICT 6 COUNTY AVERAGE	62,125.9

POVERTY POPULATION

STATE COUNTY AVERAGE	6314.1
DISTRICT 6 COUNTY AVERAGE	6967.3

AREA (SQUARE MILES)

STATE COUNTY AVERAGE	389.9
DISTRICT 6 COUNTY AVERAGE	379.1

STATE PRO BONO DISTRICT AVERAGE

14
DISTRICTS
AVERAGE OF EACH
7.14%

LAWYERS

STATE DISTRICT AVERAGE	892.9
DISTRICT 6	449

POPULATION

STATE DISTRICT AVERAGE	436,767.5
DISTRICT 6	434,881

POVERTY POPULATION

STATE DISTRICT AVERAGE	41,492.9
DISTRICT 6	48,771

AREA (SQUARE MILES)

STATE DISTRICT AVERAGE	2,561.9
DISTRICT 6	2,654